

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES OF THE WORKERS PARTY

(Program upon which the MARXIST WORKERS LEAGUE and
REVOLUTIONARY MARXIST LEAGUE have fused.)

*fusion of previous
with Workers
1944*

Price 5c

Address:

SPARK PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 35, Station E

Brooklyn, N. Y.

Label Blasted

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES OF THE WORKERS PARTY

(PROGRAM upon which the MARXIST WORKERS LEAGUE AND REVOLUTIONARY MARXIST LEAGUE have fused)

Preamble

No longer is capitalism the progressive force it used to be. In its period of growth capitalism distinguished itself by the fight for the overthrow of the feudal shackles and political despotism which prevented the development of the productive forces. In the imperialist epoch, when capitalism is decayed, when it can no longer advance society, capitalism takes over all the reactionary features of its predecessor system. Faced with unemployment, fall in profits, failure to advance the productive forces, and many other phenomena of decay, capitalism is attempting to achieve stabilization by instituting a form of planning. This planning goes hand in hand with the latest trend in modern capitalism towards statification or nationalization, measures aimed to establish some form of state capitalism. Economically, this development towards state capitalism expresses itself in the further exploitation of the workers. The capitalist class, having become tired of supporting the unemployed without obtaining any use value in return, has at last decided to integrate them in the productive process. In doing so, the tendency of capitalism is not to exploit the workers in the old, free, competitive manner, whereby the capitalists would compete for the labor power of the proletarians. The development towards state capitalism, foreshadowed by the intensification of the control power of the state over economic matters transforms the proletariat into a position of industrial serfs, within the framework of capitalist relationships, of course. State capitalism or nationalization by the bourgeois state must therefore be viewed not as a progressive step but as a further step in capitalist deterioration. This is so, because present day society has already developed to such a stage that a real advance in the productive forces is made possible, not by the substitution of one exploiting system for another as when capitalism replaced feudalism, but only by the eradication of all forms of exploitation. The change from private to state capitalism, from laissez-faire to planned capitalism is aimed to prevent the realization of socialism- a system made ripe by historical development- and as such must be viewed as acting as a brake upon the higher development of society.

Simultaneously with the development of state capitalism appear the most barbaric, despotic forms of capitalist political rule. Capitalism doffs its democratic mantle that it put on when it first came into power and gets dressed in a new, totalitarian suit of clothes. The centralization of the economy into the hands of the state brings with it an even greater centralization of political power by the state. Liberties that the working class once had are completely eliminated. Strikes are prohibited. A worker is told where he is to work and the wages he is to receive. The state loses its old appearance as something separated from society, impartial, and is forced to expose itself, because of its direct involvement in the productive process, as being the iron dictatorship of capital that it always was even under the democratic form of rule.

The proletariat must have a clear understanding of the latest trend

in capitalist development so as not to be blinded by the Stalinists, Socialists, Trotskyists et al who attempt to pass off state capitalist measures and systems as socialist. This is especially true in the case of Russia where the Stalinists and Trotskyists have attempted to utilize the workers conviction of the proletarian character of the Russian Revolution in order to get them to accept the idea that what exists now in Russia is some sort of socialism. In other cases, as in Mexico, the development towards state capitalism is acclaimed by the treacherous labor opportunists who hail the nationalization steps as an antithesis to capitalism. (Many years ago Engels and Lenin made it clear that nationalization by a capitalist state was not a socialist measure) Only those who understand the latest state capitalist trend in economic development can have a clear understanding of the new socialist society and can really begin to fight for it. All other so-called working class political parties who confuse the question are not fighting for socialism but are fighting for the abolition of private capitalism and its replacement with a state capitalism.

WE ADHERE TO THE FOLLOWING FUNDAMENTAL MARXIST DOCTRINES:

- 1) The overthrow of capitalism, accomplished in a revolutionary manner, must bring into power the proletariat which, organized as a class, wields that power through the creation of its own state machinery by breaking up the "democratic" or any other form of the capitalist dictatorship.
- 2) The dictatorship of the proletariat far from being a restriction of democracy represents the highest form of the democratic expression of the working masses. The economic and political control is wielded directly, from below, by the armed working class organized in its councils. Only by having the workers themselves in direct control of the state machinery, under the leadership of the revolutionary party, can the proletarian dictatorship develop progressively into the classless, socialist society. The development of the proletarian dictatorship towards socialism is best evidenced by the steps taken in opening up ever greater avenues for the complete democratization of the various branches of the state apparatus. The nearer to socialism the dictatorship moves, the less need for its dictatorial apparatus. The wider the control by the working masses over the state machinery, the more thorough becomes the abolition of bureaucracy, officialdom and the nearer the point reached where the dictatorship of the proletariat withers away into the classless, socialist society.
- 3) The proletariat in coming into power expropriates the means of production from the capitalists, abolishes production for profit and establishes a system of production for use. The classless, equalitarian, society is as yet not realized since the proletariat, in coming into power, cannot immediately do away with all forms of capitalistic remnants nor can it immediately wipe out with one stroke all inequalities which unavoidably are carried over into the new society. The proletarian state is established for the purpose of making that transition, of wiping out all the carryovers of capitalistic life. The proletarian

riat can, however, on overthrowing capitalism establish such a society where the basic form of production and exchange will be of a socialist nature and thus make possible the eradication of the capitalistic remnants.

- From the international character of the proletarian revolution follows the necessity for an international party organization to lead that revolution.

The international Party will practice thorough democracy and will be an organization where all national sections participate as equals. This democracy, known as democratic centralism, will enable the International to carry on unified, concerted, centralized action, at the same time that all national sections reserve the full right to criticize any of the decisions of the international body. As before national conventions, the international convention will be preceded by thorough internal discussions among the party members and, if the questions are deemed very important they shall be discussed openly before the class. In no cases are minority views to be stifled; they are to be permitted full democratic expression. The International Party Center will demand utmost obedience from its national sections to decisions passed by its conventions as the national sections will demand of their own members.

- 5) The revolutionary organization, Marxist in character, must at all times and under all conditions retain its organizational and political independence. Failure to do so means capitulation to the opportunist elements within the ranks of labor as exemplified by the Trotskyist capitulation to Social-Democracy in entering the Second International.
- 6) The proletariat in its march towards power must direct its blows against all forms of capitalistic rule and cannot become a supporter nor take a passive attitude towards the "democratic" form of bourgeois oppression. It must actively combat the fake capitalist democracy which in a thousand and one ways dupes the masses into forgetting the class nature of this form of capitalistic rule.
- 7) But while exposing this "democratic" form of capitalism and demonstrating the impossibility of the proletariat achieving power through parliamentary channels of struggle, the proletarian organization must utilize elections and the parliament as a forum to propagate its revolutionary ideas and as a platform from which to expose this parliamentary set up as representing the hidden rule of capitalism.
 - a) The proletarian organization shall at no time find itself in a position where it enters into capitalist cabinets nor find itself in a position of participating with the bourgeoisie in suppressing the independent actions of the masses. Wherever revolutionary candidates are elected into local offices, they must use their position to sabotage the machinery of the federal government, to immediately arm the proletariat, to abolish the special body of police.

Proletarian revolutionists shall at no time find them-

selves in a position where they execute capitalist laws. The purpose of revolutionists in office is not to administer the capitalist machine but to uproot it.

- b) The parliamentary activity of the revolutionary organization is subordinated to the drive for independent working class action in unions, on the streets, in the shops.
 - c) The **proletariat** must be taught that no important gain of any value can ever be attained through the parliamentary machine but must be fought for on the streets.
 - d) **Parliamentarism** becomes not only unnecessary but will prove very harmful to the revolutionary organization at a time when the proletariat is completely drawn away from parliamentarism and when the attention of the proletariat is directed to street actions and the preparation for an uprising.
- 8) In the fight against capitalism, the revolutionary organization will always come across two wings of the capitalist class, a so-called reactionary and a so-called liberal wing. In contrast to the opportunist elements who always find themselves supporting the liberal wing as a lesser evil, the Marxist organization must point out the falseness of this policy and orient the workers to a struggle against all sections of capitalism in its liberal and conservative forms.

In connection with our guiding line, namely the struggle against all forms of capitalist rule, events in Spain have supplied us valuable lessons. Spain has formed the testing ground for anyone claiming to hold an irreconcilable attitude towards bourgeois democracy. For it is there that we found a fascist and a "democratic" wing of capitalism locked in battle. It is there that we saw alleged revolutionists of the Anarcho-Syndicalist type, POUM, the Trotskyist and left-Trotskyist groupings, people who for years preached deadly combat against democratic capitalism, line up either directly or indirectly in support of liberal bourgeois oppression. This treachery went, of course, under the name of "fighting fascism". Thus, when in the first few months of the war the proletariat struggled independently against capitalism as a whole, in its fascist as well as democratic form, and when the war against fascism assumed the character of a civil war of classes, the treacherous Stalinist, Socialist, Anarchist, POUM organizations made their main task the veering of the proletariat off its class line. Once this was accomplished, once the leadership of the war passed into the hands of the democratic bourgeoisie (the liquidation of workers militias, workers' control of production, etc.) the reactionary labor leadership concentrated its efforts in getting the proletariat to lay down their lives to "fight fascism"- which in this case meant the spilling of workers blood in defense of oppression by the democratic as opposed to the fascist wing of capitalism. The workers were told that they were fighting reaction, but they were not told that in fighting in a bourgeois Peoples Army they were actually dying so that a gang of self-styled liberal

capitalists would have the right to exploit them. The slogan "a war against fascism" became transformed into the best piece of bourgeois propaganda. The failure of the Spanish proletariat to realize the transformation of the civil war of classes into an imperialist war was due precisely to the fact that they were poisoned by this abstract "anti-fascism", by this dangerous cry of "defeat reaction first".

The Spanish events teach us this: the policy of revolutionary defeatism (working for the defeat of one's own government and bourgeoisie) does not only apply to a war between two national capitalist states but to a war between two groups of capitalists within a single state. All else, all attempts to gauge events by the compass of geography instead the compass of the class struggle are merely actions of pseudo-revolutionists who have not understood the elementary point that the class struggle has no boundaries. For revolutionists, Spain is not a passing episode, to be forgotten and left alone. The behavior towards the Spanish events marks the testing ground for any political grouping's attitude towards bourgeois democracy. The test is in the concrete, in the living. For it does not matter to us how many times the Stalinists, Anarchists or Trotskyists may protest, as they do, that they are irreconcilable opponents of democratic capitalism. The hypocrisy of these treacherous people must be exposed to the workers. The workers must be taught that it is impossible to support in practice an imperialist war in defense of Spanish democratic capitalism and at the same time fight for its overthrow.

- 9) We reject any two class form of government (workers and peasants government, workers and farmers government or the "democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry"). We reject this concept on the ground that nothing in between a workers or capitalist dictatorship is possible in present day society. The rejection of the idea of a two class form of government applies equally as well to backward countries where an alliance with the peasantry is possible. The alliance with the peasantry must be understood to mean the obtaining of the aid of the peasantry for the proletariat's elevation into power and not the sharing of power with any other class.
- 10) Just as we are opposed to the idea of a two class form of rule or a workers and farmers alliance for advanced countries, equally as well do we combat the formation of a two class (Farmer-Labor) party. A Marxist organization represents only the proletariat, though in liberating the proletariat it liberates all oppressed humanity.
- 11) In 1917 there took place a victorious proletarian revolution in Russia which was crushed through a gradual counter-revolutionary process by the Stalinist bureaucracy which became transformed into the ruling capitalist class. What exists in Russia today is a state capitalist economy where the exploiters, the managers, directors, and other functionaries are in complete control of the means of production having expropriated these from the proletariat. The coming socialist revolution in Russia will be equally political as economic, since it has as its purpose not only the seizure of power from the hands of the totalitarian Stalinists.

regime but also the expropriation of the industries from the state capitalists and their return to the control of the proletariat.

- 12) We condemn and split from the policy of the social-patriots who attempt to rally the proletariat to the defense of state capitalist Russia under the slogan "defend the workers state". Likewise a condemnation of those so-called Marxists who recognize in Russia a state capitalism but who would have the working class defend imperialist Russia on the false and ridiculous ground that state capitalism is a progressive economic development worth fighting for.
- 13) In regard to the present imperialist war in Europe we state categorically and unequivocally to the world proletariat that Russia too is waging an imperialist war and is, like any other imperialist power, playing the game of power politics. It is imperative to expose the hollowness of the Trotskyist fight against Stalinism and the identical views held by Trotskyism and Stalinism in regard to their joint declaration that the invasion of Poland and Finland by Russia has a progressive significance.
- 14) The Stalinist Parties of the various countries are foreign agencies of the Russian ruling class operating within the ranks of labor. Unlike Social-Democracy which owes its allegiance to the national bourgeoisie, the Communist Parties of the various countries owe their first allegiance to the Russian ruling class and become directly allied with the national bourgeoisie only when this coincides with the foreign policy of the Russian ruling class. Even where the Communist Party operates within a country which is lined up against Russia, the Communist Party though acting as an opposition, nevertheless pursues a counter-revolutionary role, since its policies are not guided by what is best for the interests of the proletariat but what is best for the interests of the Russian ruling class. It can be said therefore that by not advocating the revolutionary road Stalinism serves the national bourgeoisie in other ways even though this national bourgeoisie is lined up against Russia.
- 15) We emphasize to the workers that only by working for the transformation of the present imperialist war into civil war, i.e., revolutionary defeatism, can the proletariat begin a real struggle against the mad slaughter begun by capitalism. We must divorce ourselves from any pacifist stand because any "anti-war" position which avoids the crucial question of civil war against capitalism in one way or another aids the bourgeoisie in driving the workers into the patriotic swamp. We reject any pacifist panaceas which aim to fight imperialist war through parliamentary action (like a war referendum, the Ludlow amendment) because by putting the anti-war fight on a parliamentary plane the real struggle, which belongs on the streets, is completely sidetracted.

We fight against the concept of an "anti-fascist" war and explain to the workers that the only war we will participate in is a civil war against capitalism.

16). In regard to so-called wars of national liberation and colonial wars, we declare:

- a) National wars of liberation had their progressive character at a time when capitalism on a world scale was on the upgrade and played a progressive role, at a time when the idea of a national state was used by capitalism to smash the feudal principalities which acted as a barrier to the development of the productive forces. The centralized state gave impetus to the development of capitalism and by doing so prepared the economic and political conditions for the rise of the proletarian class struggle and the proletarian revolution.
- b) In the imperialist epoch, when capitalism as a whole, on a world scale, is decayed, two other aspects enter into the question. In the first place, we find a situation where in all countries of Europe and the American continents the bourgeoisie is in power, occupied no more with fighting any feudal enemy, which long ago has been liquidated, but spending its energy and time in fighting the rising proletarian revolution. Wherever a national movement does spring up in any of these "oppressed" or backward countries, the national movement merely has as its aim the substitution of its own native bourgeois oppression of the workers and peasants for foreign capitalist oppression- a step which certainly is not progressive in the least. The national movement does not represent anymore a struggle of growing capitalism fighting against feudal restrictions on the productive forces, but a fight between two capitalist wings, a strong imperialist and a weak national bourgeois group. The task of the revolutionary organization is not to support a war of the weak capitalist nation against a strong imperialist power. The proletariat's duty is to combat both. This concept concretizes itself in the refusal on the part of the proletariat to support the present war on the part of the Chinese bourgeoisie against Japan. The Chinese proletariat, if it is not to lose its class perspective and if it is not to become an agent of the national bourgeoisie, must strive to disintegrate the Chinese bourgeois army, to work for the revolutionary defeat of the armed nationalist forces and for the creation of an independent proletarian militia. In those territories taken over by Japan, the Chinese proletarian struggle against imperialism is again not synonymous with the fight by the Chinese bourgeois nationalists against the Japanese imperialists. Though we could conceive of a situation where the proletariat fighting under its own banners marches separately and strikes together in an uprising against the Japanese imperialists, the present situation does not warrant such a line of approach. At present, the proletariat is not fighting on a class basis. The only possibility for its rise to a class position is by a head-on-collision against the Chiang Kai-Shek forces.

The second change that the imperialist epoch has brought into the situation is this:

In countries like India where the bourgeois revolution, in the sense of bringing the national bourgeoisie into political power, has not occurred as yet, the development of capitalist relationships by British imperialism has brought to the surface a native Indian proletariat struggling for power even before the bourgeoisie had had the opportunity to wield power. This complex phenomenon has interlocked the proletarian revolution with the bourgeois revolution, that is, it has permitted the proletariat to step in the forefront of the struggle against the feudal remnants, seize the power for itself and carry out the bourgeois revolution (division of land, etc.) to its fullest completion. Granting the possibility of the proletariat's seizure of power in India, the struggle of the Indian bourgeoisie for national liberation does not represent anymore any historical progressive step as its struggle does not act as a necessary pre-requisite for the coming into existence of the proletarian dictatorship.

The task of the Indian proletariat at present is to mobilize the peasants behind it and launch a struggle against British imperialism, a struggle whose basic content will be a class one—the struggle of the proletariat to seize power. The struggle against imperialism cannot be separated from the struggle of the proletariat to seize power in India. Should an uprising against Britain break out, the proletariat will aim to fight independently, under its own armed militia. If the proletariat succeeds to enter the uprising independently, succeeds in fighting against British imperialism under its own workers organs, then it will be confronted with the possibility of striking together with the bourgeois nationalists against the immediate, common foe—British imperialism. This, however, must be accompanied with an expose of the bourgeois nationalists and the preparation to begin a struggle against the very same "allies". Should, however, the bourgeois nationalists rise up against Britain and should the struggle only be limited to a fight between these two rivals, with the proletariat not fighting independently, the task of the proletarian revolutionists will be to refuse to support the Indian nationalists in such a struggle, to fight to disintegrate the bourgeois nationalist armed forces and the creation of an independent workers army.

c) In countries where the proletariat cannot play any decisive role in national events and where the proletariat's seizure of power is completely out of question, i. e., Arab countries (excluding Palestine) Iran, Afghanistan, Siam and other such backward areas) it is quite in order for the international revolutionists of the world to support a struggle or war on the part of the nationalist movement against imperialism. This support cannot in any way compromise the national proletariat as the national proletariat, if one could speak of a proletariat, is in a position to seize power because of the lack of capitalistic development of these countries. We give this support because of the blow at the imperialist power that such a nationalist fight delivers. The blow at the imperialist power becomes in this instance the basis for our support, although such a basis for supporting the war on the part of China is rejected by us. The difference is that whereas in China or India support of the nationalist movement glosses over the class struggle within the country and makes "the blow at imperialism" rise above the interests of the

national proletariat, in the other countries mentioned, "the blow at imperialism" is the only thing that can possibly stand out, as there exists no real proletarian class struggle to speak of.

17) Though constituting one economic unit, world capitalism in spreading its tentacles to all parts of the globe, has developed not along an even path but has undergone rather a very uneven economic development. The division of the world into advanced and backward countries is a characteristic example of this uneven development. As a result of this, the proletariat of all countries do not have the same problems and tasks in the struggle for power. In countries of a backward nature, the proletariat is confronted with the problem of struggling for the handing over of the land to the peasants, for a constituent assembly and many other democratic bourgeois demands which will win the peasantry as an ally for the proletariat. In advanced countries, where socialist tasks are on the order of the day, the proletarian revolution will be primarily a one class revolution, fought out not only against capitalist relationships in industry but against bourgeois modes of agricultural life. Viewing the problem thus, we reject for advanced countries the slogan of land to the farmers, a slogan which has as its aim the wiping out of high agricultural capitalist land relationships and the return to petty-bourgeois forms of land ownership, which in essence is a step backward in historical development. Agriculture in advanced countries being so ripe for socialism, we cannot possibly conceive of a workers and farmers alliance that can in any way benefit the proletariat.

18) On the road to building the new Marxist International, the revolutionists must declare firmly that only by independent revolutionary agitation among the working class as a whole and not by any fusion with or affiliation to reformist or centrist groupings and Internationals can the way be prepared for the formation of a new revolutionary International Party Center. The guiding formula of the Marxists in the struggle for the building of the New International must be: unity with the opportunists is a split within the ranks of labor; a split with these people is unity of the working class.

There are at present three distinct currents other than the Marxist one operating within the ranks of labor. There is reformism represented by the Second International and its affiliated Socialist Parties; the Stalinist current; and last there is the centrist current which, because of its vacillatory, changing political program, does not have a unified, single International but expresses itself in the existence of many centrist organizations each fighting each other on this or that point but having one thing in common: the rejection of the revolutionary policy.

Reformism is a political tendency representing the aristocracy of labor which is bribed the bourgeoisie and consequently forms the agency of capitalism within the ranks of labor. Far from desiring the overthrow of capitalism, from whom it derives its benefits, it seeks to preserve it, to patch it up, to reform it. Its socialistic talk is only a

cover for its counter-revolutionary deeds. Social-Democracy, seeking to reform capitalism, is consequently the upholder of the capitalist democratic system under whose form of rule its reformist activities best unfold themselves. Bourgeois democracy is therefore the goal, the dream and aspiration of Social-Democracy. Social-Democracy's "struggle" against fascism is evidently to prevent the destruction of its organization and influence by fascism and not to develop the proletarian revolution. Its "struggle" against fascism, having the aim of preserving capitalist democracy, must consequently be a failure as capitalist democracy is historically played out. To wrest the proletariat away from the influences of reformism, the Marxist organization can only have the aim of destroying the Socialist Party organization. Any illusions about reforming this bankrupt outfit can only play into the hands of the reformist leadership.

The Communist Parties outside of Russia have an entirely different role set for them than the role laid out for Social-Democracy. The Stalinist Party in America will at one time support Roosevelt, at another time oppose him; will at one time call for a bigger military budget, at another time declare against it; it will change its line from open support to the capitalist class to sabotaging the military machine of U.S. imperialism. Unlike Social-Democracy which has a consistent reformist line as it is at all times bound to support its own national bourgeoisie, Stalinism, owing allegiance to the Russian ruling class, does and must alter its positions in accordance with the change of the foreign policy of Russian imperialism. When the policy of Russian imperialism consisted in making a play for Anglo-French-American imperialisms, the policy of the Communist Parties in these countries was one of full support to the latter's war machines. The Communist Parties collaborated fully with the national bourgeoisies of these "democratic" countries in suppressing any working class revolt as it would cripple the military machine of these "democracies" and would consequently weaken Russian imperialism with whom the latter was working for an alliance. Came a change in foreign policy, concretized in German-Russo cooperation, the Communist Parties were given the task to change the line from support of "a war for democracy" to a bitter attack against the imperialist war aims of the Anglo-French entente.

This new line on the part of Stalinism must not be viewed as an ultra-left turn just as it was false to see in Stalinism a reformist tendency when it came out in support of Roosevelt. Both the "left" and "right" twists of the Communist Parties must be viewed as one big demagogic swindle of the Russian ruling class.

In dealing with Stalinism, the WORKERS PARTY does not fall into the error of approaching the American workers with the sole cry that the Stalinists are guilty of this and that treachery in Russia. Undoubtedly we make it a point to show the American workers the exploitation of the Russian workers and we go to lengths to show that it is impossible to even begin struggling for the overthrow of American capitalism if the illusion is bred that Russia is a workers state. In exposing Stalinism the WORKERS PARTY occupies the mind of the American worker with

the counter-revolutionary activities that Stalinism is guilty in America, in spite of their "left" turn, with the obstacle that Stalinism represents in America to the overthrow of American capitalism. Unless we point out to the American workers the counter-revolutionary policy of Stalinism on the day to day questions in the American class struggle, the American worker will see the thing as a "foreign" question separated from his own problems.

Within the centrist current there are two main organizational poles: the organizations belonging to the London-Amsterdam Buro and the Trotskyist "Fourth International". On the fundamental questions of the day one can hardly find a principled difference between both centrist centers and yet they are organizationally apart. The same holds true for many groupings who have split from the Trotskyists. Fundamentally they remain Trotskyist in program, but have established separate organizations because of some minor point of difference each has with the official Trotskyist organization. The WORKERS PARTY is aware of the fact that while Trotskyism and other centrist tendencies are in the wide sense of the term left-Stalinist, since they all stand for the defense of Russia, nevertheless they constitute a political tendency separate and apart from the Stalinist and are not to be put in the same pot with the Communist Parties who take direct orders from Moscow. It goes without saying that the WORKERS PARTY stands for the smashing of all these centrist organizations.

- 19) In this respect, the American revolutionists are confronted with the task of combatting the Labor Party trend which has been sweeping the country. This Labor Party is being furthered by a combination of liberals and labor elements who seek to divert the proletariat's struggle for the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism into reformist channels. The amalgamation of the "labor" leaders with the Roosevelt New Deal administration indicates clearly that the American bourgeoisie has undertaken to feed the proletariat some radical demagoguery as a result of the proletariat's disgust with the old conservative policies. Should the Labor Party go out on its own, independent of the Roosevelt group, it will be a clear indication that the American workers have become disgusted with liberal demagoguery as well, making it necessary for the labor opportunists to feed them "labor" propaganda as a means of driving them off the revolutionary road. To the Marxists of course, the Labor Party movement, far from representing any progressive development, represents a reactionary move to divert the workers from the revolutionary path. Revolutionists work for smashing the Labor Party and are opposed to affiliating to it.
- 20) We must take into account that the rise of the CIO movement shows a disgust of the American workers with the old, conservative policy of the AFL which, based on craft unionism, for years refused to organize the millions of unorganized workers. At the same time, it must be pointed out that the CIO is not an organization which came to the fore to utilize

the discontent in order to lead the workers towards militant class action. The CIO, though built on an industrial basis, has as its aim the prevention of the organization of the unorganized by the revolutionists and their being organized instead on a class collaborationist line. We show the workers that the formation of the CIO was sanctioned by the Roosevelt wing of capitalism and cannot therefore have any class struggle character. It is necessary to combat labeling the CIO as progressive by pointing out that there is nothing progressive in the organization of workers on a class collaborationist program. It is urgently necessary to help the workers rid themselves of their class collaborationist leadership.

- 21) In line with our declaration that the main enemy is at home- the American bourgeoisie- it becomes doubly necessary to expose to the workers the demagogic liberal policy of Roosevelt by which he manages to tie the proletariat to the chariot of the capitalistic government machine. We point out that the NRA, NLRB and many of the other "pro-labor" laws, together with the increasing interference of the government in labor problems, as shown by the aid it gave to the formation of the CIO and its consequent appeal for unity of the Lewis outfit with the AFL, had as their sole purpose the bringing about a governmental control over the labor unions and labor in general. We expose the anti-fascist pretensions of the Roosevelt regime by showing that while pursuing a verbal anti-fascist campaign, the Roosevelt administration borrowed one of the cardinal principles of the fascist program- the incorporation of labor into the state apparatus.

The intrusion of the Roosevelt regime into economic affairs (regulation of the agricultural output through the AAA, the regulation of hours and wages, the undertaking of a government electric enterprise, called the TVA, etc.) must not be viewed as isolated, unconnected incidents but have to be noted down by Marxists as marking a further step away from the laissez-faire theory in favor of a mild form of state capitalism. This gathering of economic power by the state brought its necessary corollary- the integration of labor under the wings of the government. Both tendencies must be fought by Marxists.

In connection with Roosevelt's attempt to bind the proletariat to the governmental apparatus, the bourgeoisie has of late gone in for a new policy in dealing with workers' demands for reforms. Years ago, the policy of the capitalist state was to obstruct and fight every demand for legislation which would, at least on paper, grant reforms to the working class, with the result that any gain which the proletariat made, was made by the workers themselves, independently of the state. This drove the proletariat further away from dependence on the capitalist state and offered revolutionists a beautiful opportunity to connect the struggle for immediate demands with the struggle for power. In realization of this danger, the American bourgeoisie (and this policy appears to have become the policy of international capital) has invented a new method by which the clamor for reforms will be partially satisfied; satisfied, however, in such a manner that will prove more harmful to the proletariat than beneficial. The state no more opposes reforms; it, in fact, initiates them. And by initiating them it obtains the support of the proletariat. The proletariat becomes so preoccupied with obtaining the new reform that

it does not realize that along with this reform come measures which bring labor into the fold of the capitalist machine and liquidate its independent existence. Thus, whereas it is true that here and there the government, through its laws has thrown a bone to the workers, the thing to remember is that along with this bone came arbitration boards, labor relation boards and many other instruments which resulted in the capitalist state's supervising and controlling the workers. The fight which liberals and pseudo-radicals have made of late for "labor legislation" represents nothing more than a drive by the bourgeoisie, by means of democratic methods and with the aid of the treacherous labor leaders, to establish a totalitarian control of labor, if not exactly similar to the one existing in Germany, at least resembling it very much. Proletarian revolutionists do not support liberal "labor legislation" which may appear to benefit the workers, all of which, however, delegates to the capitalist government the power to execute these laws. By introducing these laws the liberals and pseudo-radicals appear in the eyes of the workers as people serving the cause of labor. To support the "labor legislation" of these people means, aside from establishing governmental control over the workers, to bolster up their prestige and blind the workers' eyes to the real role of these deceivers. The policy of revolutionists must consequently be to expose this labor legislation as a step to state capitalism; to get the workers to fight independently of the state and against the state for immediate demands. Parliamentary action should be used by revolutionists only as a means of exposing the capitalist state. To obtain their demands the workers must struggle in the streets. Without such struggle, parliamentary action can only create the illusion that the workers can rely on the capitalist state to cure their ills. The policy of the revolutionists is to expose this democratic, liberal, pseudo-radical trash, to have the revolutionists elected to parliament introduce labor laws to transfer the execution of these laws to independent workers committees instead of the state.

22) We recognize fascism to be a movement aiming to do away with the democratic form of capitalist rule and to replace it with a totalitarian structure where all activities of the mass are supervised and controlled by the state which in turn represents big capital.

a) We recognize that fascism, besides representing a political weapon used to smash proletarian organizations, also represents a movement which is in conformity with the economic development towards state capitalism. Capitalist democracy flourished in the epoch of laissez-faire capitalism. The democratic form of capitalist rule was best suited to the period when capitalists wanted a free, unrestricted development of trade, industry and commerce. Having developed to a stage when free competition has become a dead letter, the necessary political corollary to this economic development is a totalitarian state structure. Fascism must therefore be looked upon as signifying in the economic sphere a conscious drive on the part of the capitalist class toward state capitalism.

The development toward state capitalism must not be viewed, however, as being the work of only fascist movements. Of late, this development has been carried on via the democratic process.

State capitalism has spread its tentacles in the United States and Mexico with the aid of labor organizations although in

Germany it grew by the smashing of the labor organizations. The aim, of course, is the same everywhere. The methods alone differ.

b) Although no blueprint can be made as to the method of the development of fascism in general, it is to be noted that in Germany and Italy fascism relied on the petty-bourgeoisie for its mass support.

c) Once having understood fascism, the problem of fighting it can then be tackled. As proletarian revolutionists, we are not part of that "anti-fascist crowd which "fights" fascism for denying the "personal liberties" enjoyed under democratic capitalism. Neither do we fall into that "anti-fascist" circle whose sole and primary activity consists in "combatting" fascism. As proletarian revolutionists we are not pure and simple anti-fascists. First and foremost we are anti-capitalists. We are also anti-fascist for no other reason than fascism is only another form of capitalism, and in fighting capitalism we of necessity have to fight fascism. Our anti-fascism is comparable to our being anti-liberal, anti-monarchist, anti-clerical, anti any form of movement or government which is not proletarian. We take special care to emphasize this point because of the latest danger that has arisen within the proletarian ranks: the tendency to concentrate on fighting fascism and forget about the fight against capitalism as a whole. In doing so, what has happened and what unavoidably had to happen was that the proletariat became the agent of democratic capitalism. It is to be concluded therefore that the fire of revolutionists must never be concentrated upon one form of reaction or another but upon the system, capitalist society, which produces that monster.

d) Revolutionists must consequently reject the simple idea of a united front against fascism (with other so-called labor organizations) which is divorced from the class struggle against capitalism. For such an "anti-fascist" united front must unavoidably become a democratic and not a labor front.

We do not believe in a united front against fascism in general just as it would have been ridiculous for the Bolsheviks in Russia to have concluded a united front with the Mensheviks against absolutism in general. We do believe and spend our efforts in propagating united front actions with other labor organizations on immediate issues, such as stopping a fascist provocation, fascist putsch, preventing a fascist demonstration and many other immediate aspects in the fight against the fascists. The point to remember is that at no time must we allow our anti-fascist activity to become an end in itself, that is, every independent or united front action against the fascists that we enter into must be viewed not from the standpoint of anti-fascist activity as such but from the standpoint that these activities are inextricably bound up with the fight against the capitalist system. Thus, every demonstration against the fascists must be permeated with the slogans tending to give the idea that fascism is the child of capitalism and that our struggle is not so much against the child as against the mother breeding the offspring. It must be emphasized that once we permit our activities against the fascists to remain pure and simple anti-fascism and not made part of the struggle against capitalism, the obvious result will be the driving of the proletariat off its class axis, the creation of a democratic front (Peoples Front) or at its best, a sort of militant kind of anti-fascism as demanded by Trotsky & Co. This militant kind of anti-fascism is nothing short of the Spanish affair

in its latter stages, where the fight against fascism became a war fought in the interests of democratic capitalism. It is quite conceivable that the democratic bourgeoisie may find it necessary once it is pressed hard enough by a militant form of anti-fascism, to even enter into a military struggle against the fascists in order to prevent the anti-fascism of the working class from expressing itself in a class form. (The Spanish example) The working class thereby submerges its class aspirations in the swamp of anti-fascism and becomes willing cannon-fodder for the democratic bourgeoisie. The bitter lessons of Spain forms a tragic witness to this latest "anti-fascist" method of intrigue used by capitalism. It is this lesson we derive from the Spanish events that demonstrates why the Spanish problem is and will remain a fundamental point dividing Marxists from the opportunists.